



Decolonial Qualitative Enactments and Modes of Inquiry: A Methodological Retrospective

Christopher C. Sonn¹ and Sunil Bhatia²

¹ Institute of Health and Sport and Moondani Balluk Indigenous Academic Centre, Victoria University

² Department of Human Development, Connecticut College

In this *Methodological Retrospective* for *Qualitative Psychology*, we identify and explain five *modes of inquiry* or five sets of *decolonial enactments* that are crucial for imagining a decolonizing methods paradigm. These are (a) emphasizing positionality and self-reflexivity; (b) centering analysis on legacies of colonialism, settler colonialism, and coloniality; (c) approaching communities as coproducers of knowledge; (d) grounding investigations in Indigenous efforts to reclaim land, language, and collective memory; and (e) highlighting mutual accompaniment, solidarity, and emancipation from multiple forms of oppression. One of the questions we hope to answer in this article is: “What makes decolonial methods unique from other critically grounded methodological perspectives?” We argue that decolonial methods are distinct but draw on other critical methods to primarily challenge the coloniality of power and knowledge that permeates much of Eurocentric psychology. We aim to demonstrate “how” to undo and “unlearn” Eurocentric forms of colonial knowledge and create new forms of decolonial knowledge. We center the lives and voices of previously colonized groups and those Indigenous groups who are dispossessed from their lands and continue to experience the brutality of settler colonialism. We offer multiple examples of decolonial-based qualitative inquiry that aims to disrupt the legacies of colonialism and coloniality. We propose that a decolonial and anticolonial methodology can counter hegemonic psychology’s epistemic violence enacted toward previously colonized people and contemporary Indigenous communities. The foundation of decolonial methods articulated here offers methodological steps and theoretical entry points that influence and guide how we use qualitative methods in reclaiming, recovering, and reproducing decolonial and anticolonial knowledge.

Keywords: decolonial and anticolonial methods, Indigenous psychology, qualitative, colonialism, coloniality and knowledge production

Biographical Statement

The colonial past and present shape our positionality as researchers, and our decolonial projects in turn are shaped by our specific positionalities,

local places, universities, disciplines, communities, geographies, and histories of colonization. A vital aspect of decolonial methods is the recognition that we write from somewhere, a contestation of a zero-point epistemology, which assumes knowledge is detached, decontextualized, and universal (Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021); this requires that we reflexively and critically engage with our positionalities, our epistemic, cultural, geographical, and social locations, that is, a locus of enunciation (Grosfoguel, 2011). As asserted by African scholar Ratele (2019), “there are no value-barren modes of being, no forms of existence outside the reach of what is desirable, good, right, worthy or valued—and their opposites” (p. 8). Here we

This article was published Online First August 14, 2025.
Heidi M. Levitt served as action editor.
Christopher C. Sonn  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6175-1030>

Sunil Bhatia  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6076-290X>
Christopher C. Sonn and Sunil Bhatia contributed equally to the conceptualization, writing, and revising of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christopher C. Sonn, Institute of Health and Sport and Moondani Balluk Indigenous Academic Centre, Victoria University, P. O. Box 14428, Melbourne, VIC 8001, Australia. Email: christopher.sonn@vu.edu.au

write about our positionality as researchers before articulating the section on the initial development of decolonial theory in psychological inquiry.

Sunil—my positionality is shaped by my exposure to British and American colonial psychology and by the erasure and silences surrounding caste inequalities (Bhatia & Ram, 2001, 2004, 2023). When I was growing up in India, my family, community, and the textbooks in my school were willing to engage in discussions about the devastating impact of British colonialism on our psyche and society, but there was an absolute silence about caste oppression or our caste privileges. I knew that caste oppression and hierarchies were one of the foundations on which Indian society was built, but I did not fully understand what it means to be a Dalit. The absence of any meaningful dialogue or reflection on the intersecting histories of caste oppression and British colonialism shaped my positionality as a psychologist during my undergraduate and graduate education at the University of Pune in India. The British colonization of India was based on a racist regime of terror, as it imprisoned and oppressed Indians for over 200 years. In the 1990s, when I came as an international student to the United States to study psychology, I encountered this colonial psychology in another benevolent form in the doctoral program. The psychology I was taught in my graduate school in the United States was largely built on Eurocentric psychology and Western cultural assumptions of self, family, and community. While the doctoral program was still founded on Eurocentric psychology, my broader university education and informal scholarly networks also exposed me to the critical, narrative, linguistic, and cultural turns in psychology that were articulating the limitations of understanding psychology only through a scientific and Western lens. In particular, my introduction to postcolonial scholars allowed me to articulate the legacy of colonialism that lived inside me. The “Empire” was deeply intertwined with my evolving self. From my positionality both as a postcolonial subject in India and as a migrant occupying space on Indigenous land, I along with my colleagues have made efforts to decolonize psychology (Bhatia, 2002, 2018, 2021; Bhatia et al., 2024; Bhatia & Priya, 2018, 2021; Bhatia & Ram, 2023; Macleod et al., 2017).

Christopher—I am an immigrant to Australia, where I live and work on the unceded lands of the Boonwurrung, Bunurong, and Wurrundjeri of the Kulin Nation. I grew up during the Apartheid period in South Africa with the imposed identity label of “colored” and in a community designated as “colored” under the Group Areas Act. Many have written about the struggles of this community, their erasure and invisibility, and roots in a longer history of slavery and colonialism that continue to shape struggles for belonging, place, and recognition (e.g., Erasmus, 2001). A note that my grandfather wrote in a book on South Africa’s history encouraged me to make time to understand how our ancestors’ struggles have been left out in the history of the country of our birth and to never let any person look down upon us. I did not comprehend then the significance of his message, which in some way has shaped the trajectory of my work—to uplift the stories of racialized and marginalized communities. In my research, I have delved into South African migrant experiences of Apartheid and post-Apartheid South Africa as well as other racialized groups’ experiences and the implications of these for migration, displacement, and place-making in settler colonial Australia (Sonn et al., 2021; Sonn & Fisher, 2003; Sonn & Lewis, 2009). Through the lenses of community, cultural, and liberation psychology (e.g., Montero & Sonn, 2009), I have assembled theoretical, methodological, and praxis tools including qualitative methods and arts-based inquiry to document and understand the psychosocial effects and political practices of various systems of oppression, such as the Apartheid in South Africa and settler colonialism in Australia (Agung-Igusti et al., 2021; Balla et al., 2022; Sonn, 2024). This process has entailed critically reflecting on the role of knowledge production practices that erase, misrepresent, and misrecognize strategies of resistance and survival in contexts characterized by racialized, patriarchal violence (Sonn, 2012; Stevens et al., 2013). In recent work that uses interviews, workshops, and open-ended surveys, we continue to build on the project of expanding ecologies of knowledge and solidarity praxis, of pushing beyond discipline bound methods to elevate knowledge of the multiple, complex, and creative ways people and communities resist, survive, and enact liberation (Fernández et al., 2021; Sonn, Agung-Igusti, et al., 2024; Sonn et al., 2021).

While we grew up in different locations, we have been brought together through our shared transnational colonial histories, as well as our interest and commitment to decolonial psychology in the areas of migration, postcolonial studies, and cultural psychology. Our lives, as well as our research projects, have been shaped by our respective embeddedness in the histories of empire and the postcolonial conditions of our homes in the Global South. Colonialism and coloniality were not abstract systems for us. They were present in our education, universities, language, neighborhoods, consciousness, systems of governance, monuments, statutes, and our false beliefs that all legitimate and superior knowledge came from elsewhere—namely, Europe and the United States.

Our positionalities as decolonial producers of knowledge then allow us to disrupt the coloniality of power that is foundational to Western theory and research in psychology. We have both been drawn to psychology and have, over the years, struggled with the discipline and its history of complicity with enacting matrices of power/privilege and supporting dispossession and disadvantage. We have both, with other scholar-activists, navigated our subdisciplines searching for and crafting ways in which we could mobilize and reimagine psychology methods in ways that would support Indigenous self-determination and voices from the Global South and the South in the North and reveal the devastating personal psychosocial legacies of slavery, casteism, forced migration, and settler colonialism.

The Initial Development of Decolonial Theory and Practice in Psychological Inquiry

In the past decade, there has been an increase in scholarship in psychology on decolonial topics and calls for decolonial methods in research. Writing in the context of community psychology, [Sonn and Stevens \(2021\)](#); [Sonn, Fernández, et al., 2024a](#)) have highlighted the diverse intellectual lineages and genealogies of decoloniality across histories and geographies as a site of intellectual engagement. They emphasize that the recent decolonial turn has challenged the dominance of hegemonic Western Eurocentric frameworks of world-making and the coloniality of power. [Thambinathan and Kinsella \(2021\)](#) suggested that there is an ongoing debate concerning

“decolonizing research paradigms and whether it is possible to decolonize research when using pre-existing colonial, Eurocentric paradigms created by Western scholars” (p. 2). There is an emerging body of decolonial scholarship that provides us with instructive insights about developing a foundation for conducting decolonial research (e.g., [Kessi et al., 2022](#)). For some scholars, decolonization is about land rights, reclaiming land, and sovereignty ([Tuck & Yang, 2012](#)), and for others it is about delinking from the Eurocentric power-knowledge nexus ([Mignolo & Walsh, 2018](#)). For some scholars, there is a recognition that the devastating legacy of the colonial encounter cannot be reversed, but there is an urgency to build a decolonized world for the vast majority of humanity who are suffering from poverty, casteism, hunger, unemployment, degraded housing, lack of education, and sanitation ([Bhatia, 2019](#)).

Colonialism, simply put, is the act of dominating another country, people, or territory. It is a complex structure coded into “economic and social institutions through culturally constructed racist hierarchies that were presented as though given in nature” ([Watkins & Shulman, 2008](#), p. 2). While colonialism as a formal administrative process has ended in many former colonies, decolonial scholars have argued that coloniality endures long after colonialism has ended ([Quijano, 2000](#)). Global inequalities and ecological inequities with roots in colonialism and *global coloniality* disproportionately impact people from formerly colonized countries and environments ravaged by European exploitation, genocide, theft, and extraction of knowledge with no reciprocal exchange ([Ndlovu-Gatseni, 2020](#)). Different forms of *coloniality* and the ways it is enacted and experienced are maintained

alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day. ([Maldonado-Torres, 2007](#), p. 243)

Decolonial knowledge has ushered in a critical awareness that we breathe coloniality every day, and the field of Eurocentric hegemonic psychology has been complicit in creating, reproducing, and maintaining its coloniality of power. This coloniality is evident in how Eurocentric psychological theories are typically framed as universal, scientific,

and applicable to the majority of humanity. [Thalmayer et al. \(2021\)](#) highlighted this assumed universality of these theories, stating

it may be fair to conclude that 11% of the world's population is now being represented in psychology's most prominent journals, but that 89% of the world remains neglected in this database. The improved inclusion of this 89% remains an ethical, intellectual, and professional imperative for psychological science. (p. 128)

A vital initial step for students and experienced researchers alike when embracing decolonial methods is to become aware of the long and devastating consequences of colonialism and forcefully interrogating the assumptions of what counts as valid knowledge in psychology, whose questions are pursued, whose interests are served, and who are considered to be legitimate producers of psychological knowledge. Decolonial scholarship has highlighted how scientific reasoning as a key principle of European enlightenment has been used to justify genocide and exploitation and how coloniality continues to constrain human possibilities and imagination ([Maldonado-Torres, 2016](#)). The growing scholarship in psychology that engages with decolonial topics is concerned with tracing the roots, pathways, and diverse praxes that constitute decolonial work and that speak to the challenges, realities, and experiences of the Majority World (e.g., [Boonzaier & van Niekerk, 2019](#); [Comas-Fíaz et al., 2024](#); [Fernández et al., 2021](#); [Kessi, 2017](#); [Sonn, Fernández, et al., 2024a](#)).

In this article, we draw from our efforts within this growing body of work with local and translocal networks of scholars from different disciplines, as well as activists who are engaging in critical and emancipatory work, each speaking from our unique histories and social locations. We outline five decolonial methods that we have distilled from our work that uses plural and intersecting qualitative methods such as life stories, ethnography, storytelling, and visual methods: decolonial feminist and liberation-oriented methodologies that center relational epistemologies and relational or dialogical ethics ([Bell et al., 2020](#); [Fals-Borda, 1987](#); [Lugones, 2010](#); [Macleod et al., 2020](#); [Montero & Sonn, 2009](#)), decolonial love ([hooks, 2018](#); [Sandoval, 2000](#)), and liberation psychology ([Martín-Baró, 1994](#); [Montero & Sonn, 2009](#)). From this work, decolonial qualitative psychology challenges epistemologies that are decontextualized, ahistorical, and that assume universality. Decolonial methods embrace

what [Maldonado-Torres \(2017a\)](#) referred to as a decolonial attitude, “an orientation toward oneself, others, one’s surroundings, what has been imposed, and what one considers less alienation” (p. 802). Decolonial methods do not separate ethics and theory from practice but center the synergy of theory–action–reflection, or praxis, the interconnectedness of ways of knowing, doing, and being ([Smith, 2012](#)). Decolonial methods engage with stories, history, and community-based knowledge in an attempt to disrupt the legacies of colonialism and coloniality. For [Neville et al. \(2024\)](#), decolonizing psychological sciences involves “practices that (a) uncover and dismantle the epistemic violence against that Global Majority and (b) center the lived experiences and epistemological positions of those most affected by oppression” (p. 91).

Euro-American psychological science continues to be the dominant framework for producing core theories of self, identity, cognition, and emotions that are largely based on people residing in the United States and Europe ([Arnett, 2008](#); [Thalmayer et al., 2021](#)). It is not just that Euro-American psychology fails to “include” the experiences of people from the Global South, who are indeed part of the Majority World. Rather, this hegemonic psychology actively exports psychological knowledge to the rest of the world. Contemporary Euro-American psychology has once again taken on an imperial guise by exporting new psychological tests and instruments, discourses, and Western forms of knowledge production to the Global South ([Bhatia, 2018](#)). As [Henrich et al.’s \(2010\)](#) research demonstrated, an American undergraduate student is 4,000 times more likely to be randomly selected as a subject for research than a random non-Western individual. Māori scholar [Smith \(2012\)](#), pointing to the role of scientific research in advancing the colonial project, has noted that “the word, ‘research,’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (p. 1). One feature of the growing field of *decolonial psychology* is that it recenters and validates the experiences, knowledge, and narratives of people who live in marginalized communities across the globe and in the Majority World ([Adams et al., 2015](#); [Maldonado-Torres, 2007](#)). Articulating the complex history and fundamental ideas that form the body of knowledge that we call “decolonial methods” is then an *ethical, political, and intellectual* imperative for psychology.

Arguably, there is no single origin for decolonial scholarship and approaches, but it is instead heterogeneous with diverse tributaries, genealogies, and registers. Yet, writers in psychology often cite the seminal work of Du Bois (1994) and later Césaire and Kelley (2000) and Fanon (1982; Bulhan, 1985), in particular their critical writing on the problem of Blackness and their deep existential phenomenological critique of colonialism and coloniality (Maldonado-Torres, 2017a, 2017b, 2021). This theorizing is central to understanding colonialism as a structure and psychopolitical praxis, as creating the “zones of non-being” that lock racialized peoples into conditions of inferiority and otherness (Fanon, 1982). Informed by this scholarship, key aims of decolonial methods are to make visible the mechanisms and processes of colonialism and coloniality and how this is maintained and reproduced while at the same time advancing methods and praxis that contribute to creating knowledge otherwise and lifeworlds that are affirming and free from violence.

A Description of the Evolution of Decolonial Modes of Inquiry and Practices

Decolonial theories and approaches shed light on the unfinished business of colonization and colonialism highlighting how asymmetrical power relationships between the various nations in the so-called global North and South continue in the present (e.g., Adams et al., 2015; Bhatia, 2018; Carolissen & Duckett, 2018; Comas-Díaz, 2021; David & Okazaki, 2006; Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Dutta, 2022; Fine, 2021; French et al., 2020). Decolonization is not a method per se, or a methodology, but can be viewed as a set of intersecting practices and modes of inquiry that are anchored in theories that seek to unsettle the assumed universality of Eurocentric knowledge hierarchies and ways of being. Indigenous scholarship has, in particular, called into question Euro-American onto-epistemologies (the interlinked nature of being and knowing) that assume knowing can be abstracted from ways of life. Indigenous onto-epistemologies are based on assumptions about the world that center human, nonhuman, and land coconstitution (Ciofalo et al., 2022; Dudgeon & Walker, 2015; Fish & Gone, 2024). Key goals of the decolonial turn in psychology include delinking from dominant Western epistemologies that promote research developed in

Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic societies (Henrich et al., 2010) and moving away from the coloniality of modern individualist lifeways toward collective lifeways (Adams & Estrada-Villalta, 2017; Adams et al., 2015). Decolonial approaches also challenge the dominant ways of creating psychological knowledge by countering the idea that a narrow definition of scientific research and methods is the only reliable process for creating a valid form of psychological knowledge (Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Fine, 2021).

In his classic book, *Decolonization of Mind: The Politics of Language in Language in African Literature*, Thiong'o (1986) showed how the British used English as an instrument to colonize the minds, souls, memories, and histories of people living in Africa. He wrote that the biggest weapon unleashed by the British Empire was to throw “cultural bombs” in their colonies. Thiong'o elaborated

the effect of the cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves, for instance, with other peoples' languages rather than their own. (p. 3)

Thiong'o's (1986) excerpt illustrates how colonization creates an identity in which the colonized see their past cultural heritage and language as inferior and something to be looked down upon as a “wasteland.” The colonizers' culture and identity—their ways of being, habits, education, speech, and knowledge—become standardized, idealized, and transformed into a colonial mentality.

The project of decolonial methods means that we have to undo and unlearn the colonizers' ways of being, habits, language, and knowledge and reconfigure psychology in a way that stops the field from reproducing the coloniality of knowledge and being (Freire, 1972; Ratele, 2019). One important goal of decolonial methods is to explore and create new knowledge that acknowledges, validates, and transforms the long-term effects of the so-called “cultural bomb” on people in colonial and post-colonized contexts. Decolonial methods, however, are not just intended for explicating the societal and psychological damage caused by legacies of colonialism, but instead they create new knowledge that affirms, elevates, and directly speaks and

heals the collective and individual lives that have endured the oppressive legacies of colonialism.

Decolonization engages with colonialism and imperialism, and in the context of research, this entails examining deep assumptions, values, practices, and motivations for research (Smith, 2012). Consistent with other critical scholarship, including feminist, critical theory, and social constructionist approaches, decolonial research practices have involved creating new ways of doing research that have troubled some basic assumptions underpinning the knowledge and practices of researchers. What distinguishes decolonial methods from other critical methods is the specific analysis of how 500 years of European colonialism and conquest has produced the modern/colonial capitalist world system (Grosfoguel, 2002, 2011) or as expressed by Adams et al. (2015) “the colonality of the modern global order” (p. 215). Coloniality in the modern global order and the knowledge that constituted this order (including psychological knowledge) was largely created by Western global domination. Western psychological science was embedded in conceptions of capitalism, modernity, and rationality that came to be considered intellectual progress and the highest form of human development, often displacing indigenous psychologies (Adams & Estrada-Villalta, 2017; Adams et al., 2015).

Decolonial methods have put a spotlight on the limitations of conceptualizing research as a neutral activity, questioning the harmful binary conceptions of self and the world, challenging the conception of the solo knowledge creator, interrogating neoliberal conceptions of research productivity and research practices that are decontextualized and ahistorical, and only in service of theory building. Along with these new ways of reconfiguring knowledge production, decolonial scholars have also made calls to embrace alternative knowledges (Gone, 2016), ethical, epistemological, and ontological standpoints rooted in the lived experiences of people from the Majority World and their ways of knowing, doing, and being (Ciofalo, 2019; Fernández et al., 2021; Sandoval, 2000; Suffla & Seedat, 2021). Scholars have made efforts to reengage with psychologies’ multiple knowledges and archives and to develop a psychological research praxis that addresses epistemological violence (Teo, 2010); epistemic injustice (Stevens & Sonn, 2021); harmful legacies of colonialism on selfhood, identity, and community (Bhatia, 2018); and historical trauma (Gone, 2021).

In this Methodological Retrospective for Qualitative Psychology, we identify and explain five principles for inquiry that we see as crucial for imagining and enacting methods for decolonizing qualitative psychology. These principles are listed below.

1. *Emphasizing positionality and self-reflexivity*, which relates to our critical reflection on our biographies and social locations in the context of research and engagement.
2. *Grounding investigations in Indigenous efforts to reclaim land, language, and collective memory*, which holds implications for pointing research questions, methods, and practices toward self-determinations.
3. *Centering analysis on legacies of colonialism, settler colonialism, and colonality* highlights the importance of asking questions about power/oppression in research and practice.
4. *Approaching communities as coproducers of knowledge* brings attention to the importance of understanding community knowledge and the role of relationality in using methods for emancipatory enactments.
5. *Mutual accompaniment, as solidarity for emancipation from multiple forms of oppression*, explains accompaniment practices and offers ways to use research methods as solidarity practice.

These orientations are not mutually exclusive but can be used together, or stand alone, and can form the basis for decolonial qualitative enactments and research. They provide entry points for unlearning, reimagining, and mobilizing methods, theories, and praxis as decolonial commitments toward “creating the world of the you” (Fanon, 1982, p. 232). We suggest that researchers can use various methods and bring these into dialogue with these principles anchored in a decolonial attitude.

Contemporary Adaptations of Decolonial Enactments: Foundations for Decolonial and Anticolonial Methodologies

Emphasizing Positionality and Self-Reflexivity

As we have noted at the beginning of this article, critical engagement with the politics of

our locations and the coloniality of knowledge is a vital practice of decolonial methods. Critical feminist scholars have shown that we have a responsibility to contest epistemic practices that perpetuate monological worldviews through epistemic violence (Macleod et al., 2020). Decolonial feminist, Indigenous scholars, and scholars of color have all repeatedly advocated for epistemic pluralism and epistemic freedom as essential to decolonial methods. Critically engaging with positionality through reflexive practice and relationality is central to this effort. When we center positionality in decolonial or critical methods, we acknowledge

- (1) the fluidity of our ever-changing social identities; (2) the abstract, intangible nature of our social identities; (3) the difficulty of knowing which facets of our social identity are more influential over time and place; and (4) how our social identities impact the research process. (Jacobson & Mustafa, 2019, p. 2)

Thus, it is not enough to say that colonization shapes our identities and subject positions as researchers, but rather from a decolonial methods perspective, we have to specify very clearly how colonization impacts our research positionality, the choice of our questions, the methods we deploy, the communities we collaborate with, the power relationship between knowledge and methods, and whom we are producing knowledge for.

Our disciplinary positionalities socialize us into choosing particular methods and questions and train us to become knowledge producers within the parameters set by the discipline, by our scholarly networks, and by geographically situated universities that have the power to sanction what counts as valid and invalid knowledge. The questions of which scholars are considered worthy of being cited, whom we perceive as credible scholars from the past and present, and what research questions and methods are considered important in the field are also shaped by the norms of our discipline and the geographic location of our universities. For example, Ozoguz (2025) drew on a transnational study that used feminist ethnography to explore women in Turkey's freedom dreams to show the complexity of power and reflexivity in research-participant relationships. Ozoguz examined field notes guided by intersectional and decolonial conceptions of power to show that U.S.-centric conceptualizations of identity, roles, and dreams can penetrate

researchers' understandings of how women make sense of their roles, dreams, and desires. The research showed the importance of critically examining these deeper assumptions of freedom dreams expressed in different milieu because not doing so can reproduce hierarchies and further polarization across differences. They suggested that reflexivity should move beyond surface descriptions of social categories to more nuanced understandings of various structures and their intersections in the research process and embrace the practice of radical listening with humility.

Methodological positionality is shaped by what Fine (2018) called our methodological imagination—which reimagines methods not only as a formula, a recipe, or a set of guidelines but as a set of practices and inquiries that speak to our contentious times. Here, methods open up fractures and reveal knowledge that gives us insights into how and why collisions and clashes occur between people, communities, and histories. Methodological positionality in our discipline establishes the types of methods that are considered valid, reliable, and scientific and others that are perceived as soft, unreliable, or unscientific. Acknowledging positionality does not mean that there is no room for developing solidarity across decolonial projects (Bhatia et al., 2024; Fernández et al., 2021). Instead, articulating positionalities shows us the spaces where coalitions are possible, where tensions exist, and where collaborations may not be possible (Tuck & Yang, 2018). South African psychologists Kiguwa and Segalo (2018) argue that

such positioning matters for how we choose what we teach, how it is packaged, and how it is presented. This is part of engaging the hidden curriculum. Engaging the socio-history of the discipline—its worldviews and philosophical underpinnings—is linked to our specific orientations and view of the self-in-the-world. (p. 13)

Thus, positionality and critical reflexivity offer one practice that is vital to examining the dynamics of power within research practice as well as curriculum design and training. The lenses put forward by critical, feminist, Indigenous, and other minoritized scholars are powerful resources that can help expand the pluriverse of psychology by disrupting the coloniality of power, affirming community knowledges and Indigenous Knowledges, and challenging epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007).

Grounding Investigations in Indigenous Efforts to Reclaim Land, Language, and Collective Memory

Many examples of Indigenous research and action show different assumptions about being and existence and how decolonial methods are mobilized in support of self-determination, decolonization, and healing (e.g., Ciofalo et al., 2022; Flores Osorio & Vicente Xiloj, 2022; Rua et al., 2021). As stressed by Ciofalo et al. (2022),

as Indigenous psychologies center on collective wellbeing conceived as individual, family, and community wellbeing, and all our relations with humans, nonhumans, and nature, these can inform the coconstruction of Indigenous community psychologies conceived as social movements for cultural, epistemic, ecological, and healing justice. (p. 285)

Smith (2012) outlined 25 Indigenous projects as a way of researching back that engage with colonialism and imperialism and the imperatives for survival, justice, healing, and self-determination. While many of the projects that she lists are rooted in these struggles for survival, they have significant implications for research and action that seek to build different worlds without “hierarchies of difference that dehumanize subjects and communities and that destroy nature” (Maldonado-Torres, 2016, p. 10). In a special issue on “Decolonising Psychological Science,” Adams et al. (2015) named Indigenous Resistance, the process and practice of reclaiming place-based knowledge, as a decolonial method. Wilson (2008) wrote about Indigenous research as ceremony. He noted that Indigenous research has an ontology, axiology, and methodology that influences how to think about knowledge and research and is not necessarily something to be absorbed into Western approaches. The development of Kaupapa Māori theory and research practice is an example of decolonizing methodologies and cultural resistance (Rua et al., 2021; Smith, 2012). Similarly, in Australia, Aboriginal scholars have articulated place-based knowledge anchored in Indigenous conceptions of country, culture, and community that is central to social and emotional well-being as a framework for promoting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health and well-being (Gee et al., 2014).

Writing in the context of community psychology about developments in Aotearoa and Australia, Glover et al. (2005) defined decolonization as a process “that assists indigenous people to identify

as members of a racial group that has been systematically oppressed by the dominant culture; it enables them to take action towards social transformation” (p. 332). They pointed to several theoretical approaches, such as critical, feminist, and liberation psychology, that can be inclusive of Indigenous approaches and endorse Indigenous rights, that can provide avenues for deconstruction and critique of dominant systems, and that work to support cultural rights and safety. A key part of this project is the reclamation and affirmation of Indigenous cultural systems, self-determination, and expertise, as well as recognizing the limitations of and inappropriateness of Western-based Eurocentric systems to respond to the needs and aspirations of Indigenous communities.

Gone (2021) has argued for the retrieval and use of American Indian therapeutic traditions because it promises to address issues of mental health and well-being where Western modalities continue to fall short. Decolonization as a framework is a generative and innovative approach that encompasses various qualitative methodologies and methods (Gone, 2021). In efforts to decolonize American Indian expertise, Gone drew on life stories and vignettes, a form of archival retrieval and remembering, to retrieve traditional healing practices and “doctoring traditions,” which are rooted in Indigenous epistemologies. Indigenous epistemologies include “proper relationships with Those Above” (p. 264), other-than-human patrons. In practice, “Humans convey respect to more powerful Others through prayer and sacrifice, while Those Above are moved to respond through attention and compassion” (p. 264). For Gone, decolonization requires that we examine power in creating knowledge and practice in counseling and other psychologies and that we move beyond the metaphorical usages to “repatriation of Indigenous lands and relationships to land” (p. 268). Thus, Gone argued that embracing a decolonization agenda would transform the foundational theoretical and methodological paradigms in counseling psychology inquiry. A decolonization approach to knowledge that emphasizes Indigenous resistance will “legitimize local knowledge, recover communal meaning systems, and motivate collective action in communities that continue to grapple with coloniality” (Gone, 2021, p. 267). Decolonial methods such as retrieving Indigenous knowledge, remembering historical accounts, and engaging in linguistic and cultural reclamation recenter Indigenous inquiry

and non-Eurocentric ways of knowing, doing, being, and healing to address the harmful psychosocial legacies of slavery, caste oppression, and settler colonialism, respectively.

Decolonial psychology is based on a collective vision that reimagines research as “methods for oppressed and impoverished communities to radically imagine their existence outside of the superimposed borders of coloniality, neoliberalism, racism, and other systems of oppression” (Adames et al., 2024, p. 6). Decolonizing methods have been productive as a means of highlighting the epistemic violence of Eurocentric psychology, but psychological research has yet to focus on decolonial outcomes that lead to repatriation/repatriation of land. It is in the context of struggles for reclaiming land and expanding the pluriverse of ways of knowing, doing, and being that makes decolonial research unique and different from other critical methods. Fish and Gone (2024) argued that if decolonial methods and research

does not repatriate or repatriate Indigenous land, but instead makes psychologists complicit in colonial efforts through what Tuck and Yang (2012) described as rhetorical “moves to settler innocence,” what alternatives are there for engaging in psychological inquiry that advances Indigenous futures and destroys colonial ones? (Fish & Gone, 2024, p. 123)

This is a critical question that is at the heart of building decolonial and anticolonial methodologies.

Complementing decolonial efforts to undo the harms of Eurocentric psychology, Fish and Gone (2024) proposed that anticolonial methodological foundations in psychology can be conceived of as an alternative to decolonial efforts because it is primarily concerned with creating thriving and equitable Indigenous futures for, with, and by Indigenous communities.

Anticolonialism, which refers to Indigenous resistance and opposition to colonialism (Hartmann et al., 2019), is a potential alternative to decolonization that can circumvent the aforementioned issues by placing the power to challenge psychological research norms, assumptions, and outcomes squarely in the hands of Indigenous peoples. (Fish & Gone, 2024, p. 120)

An anticolonial methodology promotes the recovery, reclamation, and revitalization of Indigenous Knowledge systems within the context of settler colonialism and assumes that Indigenous communities are active producers of knowledge and that their research efforts are aimed at healing and restoring Indigenous life, communities, and land.

For anticolonial and decolonial methodologies of psychology to flourish, we need to be able to refuse Eurocentric standards and how coloniality appears in psychology (Fish & Gone, 2024). Survivance and remembering are acts of decolonial resistance (Smith, 2012). Survivance, a term coined by Indigenous scholar Gerald Vizenor (see Wilbur & Gone, 2023), refers to the multiple ways in which Indigenous people retrieve and reclaim their cultural and spiritual identity when they are faced with oppression. Remembering, Smith (2012) noted, is a decolonial move that asks “a community to remember what they may have decided to ... forget” (p. 147). Both survivance and remembering are decolonial methods of recuperation and cultural reclamation. Anticolonial methodologies are Indigenous-led and critical and center Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, and being.

This reorientation raises many critical questions for non-Indigenous researchers about researching and being ethically in solidarity relationships. This includes, as Land (2015) has noted, reckoning with complicity, which is “multifaceted, involving admitting one’s embroilment in a society that provides unearned dividends to certain groups of people, and admitting that one operates from within the structures that one critiques” (p. 247). Reckoning with complicity centers critical reflexivity and is vital to unpacking various moves to innocence, moves that avoid critically engaging with decolonization. For researchers, this critical process of reckoning means different things to differently positioned people. The processes include engaging through all phases of research with the tensions and challenges of researchers situating themselves in the context of historically constituted power relations (i.e., coloniality of power); valuing and engaging in respectful ways with Indigenous Peoples and efforts that prioritize their knowledges systems; and supporting desires and goals of self-determination and cultural survivance.

Centering Analysis on Legacies of Colonialism, Settler Colonialism, and Coloniality

There is a growing body of work in psychology in which researchers examine the legacies of colonialism, settler colonialism, and coloniality in different contexts around the world (e.g., Beals et al., 2021; Bhatia, 2002, 2018;

Bulhan, 1985, 2015; Macleod et al., 2017). The Apartheid Archive Project (AAP) in South Africa (see Stevens et al., 2013) is one example of how scholars have centered the analysis of the legacy of colonialism and Apartheid, a particular expression of settler colonialism, and its continuities in the present through structural violence, including racism, poverty, and sexism. The AAP sought to address the absences, silences, and omissions of quotidian stories of marginalized groups from official accounts for scholars and other record keepers. The project set out to collect the stories and narratives of everyday people about their experiences and memories of race and racism during the Apartheid period and its continuities in the present. A key foundation of the study was the notion of psychosocial mnemonics, stories as resources for insight into lived experiences, and storytelling as a modality for knowledge production, to remember the past, and to understand its continuities in the present. Building on the work of feminist, critical race, and Indigenous scholarship and critical community psychology, Sonn et al. (2013) argued that storytelling can be used as a methodology within a broader program of work to uncover racism, to create opportunities for remembering, and to create spaces for collective sharing and telling stories that are needed to contest absences in public memory.

In the AAP, personal stories were the key information collected as these were seen as a vital and legitimate means to prevent erasure, to expand on existing archives, and to mobilize memory in recovery and rebuilding processes. The stories were collected by a wide range of researchers, including students and academic researchers, from people with specific experiences (e.g., ex-combatants, domestic workers, men, women, “Blacks,” “Whites,” “colored” people, Indians) via interviews and open-ended surveys. A goal was to collect a diverse body of narratives using a range of strategies and make it possible for people to submit via an online portal. The development of this archive of stories also supported the use of different decolonial methods, such as critical discourse analysis and narrative analysis. Thus, researchers have asked different questions and have used different theories and conceptual lenses such as psychoanalytic theory (e.g., Gobodo-Madikizela, 2012) to examine the past in the present, with full recognition of the limits of stories, the tensions between everyday stories and academic analysis, and the ethics involved

in speaking and listening positions in research practice. Yet, in the AAP project, storytelling was used as a decolonial method because it was enmeshed with activism, remembering, and revitalization and not only academic theorizing (see Smith, 2012; Watkins & Shulman, 2008). Centering the recovery of historical memory (Martín-Baró, 1994) is an important step in affirming racialized people’s experiences and lifeworlds (Biko, 1988). The project in many ways enacted what Reyes Cruz and Sonn (2015) articulated as a decolonizing standpoint that recognizes the positioning of people not typically included as knowers, the stories that have existed as resources within and for communities, and how psychologists position themselves in the process of generating alternative psychological knowledge.

Working within a decolonial framework, Segalo (2016; Segalo et al., 2015) offered another example of how researchers have used and extended the potential of qualitative methods to contribute to the project of social transformation and dealing with the trauma of Apartheid and gender-based violence in South Africa. Segalo described the process of using embroidery as a visual methodology with a collective of women to express the unspeakable—their stories of violence. The embroideries stitched by the women depicted images of children harmed, being robbed, unsafe streets, and more. These embroideries and the process of stitching served as means to raise awareness about the effects of violence, patriarchy, and coloniality within Apartheid; the everydayness of this violence; and the implications for well-being and people’s capacity to live meaningful lives. Segalo’s research project is a compelling agentic psychology that uncovers how Black South African women who grew up during Apartheid used embroidery as a “decolonial project to make sense of their self, trauma, silence, and gender identity” (Segalo et al., 2015, p. 345).

Another example of how psychologists engage with generational community knowledge is captured in Gone’s (2021) research on understanding the American Indian concepts of selfhood that emerge from his community-based ethnographies that he has conducted in collaboration with Gros Ventre people of the Fort Belknap Indian reservation in north central Montana. Gone argues that some

lands and landscapes are alive within our cosmologies, but these living entities remain sentient and possess other qualities of personhood (e.g., agency, empathy) and (above all) power for human well-being, including

therapeutic benefit. In sum, repatriation of Indigenous lands through decolonization is required for the restoration of right relationships in the cosmos that are the well-springs of Indigenous health and life. (p. 8)

Gone utilized ethnography, narrative, personal history, and oral history to document and describe a framework of healing and well-being for Indigenous populations who have experienced historical trauma (Hartmann et al., 2019). Similarly, Fernández's (2022) recent scholarship provides a useful example of how to speak about historical trauma and colonial wounds through the use of *mujerista liberation psychology* and *testimonio* as a way to build critical self-reflexive dialogues and community well-being. Decolonial methods elevate "generating knowledge with and from within" (Fernández et al., 2021, p. 6). Decolonial methodological practices are rooted in intersections of the body, local place, self, and community. Embodied knowing and healing are equally important in decolonial methods as intellectual knowing. Thus, retrieving historical memory, storytelling, restoring and repatriating land, connecting to Indigenous cosmologies and rituals, engaging in community-based ethnographies, collecting oral histories, and sharing testimonios and dialogues to address trauma and colonial healing provide us with examples of how researchers can engage with histories of colonialism and oppression and its continuities in the present. The examples provided here demonstrate that decolonial projects yield valuable data collection that documents colonialism and its impacts. The examples listed in this section demonstrate how decolonial projects can result in rich archives that document the effects of colonialism. In addition to building solidarity, restoring community memory, and healing, these archives hold information that can serve as resources for further qualitative inquiry using various critically oriented methods to address questions.

Approaching Communities as Coproducers of Knowledge

In our work with different diaspora communities, we have been guided by values of collaboration and participation, as well as the concerns of communities, recognizing that researchers and others from academic settings have not always acted in good faith, taking knowledge and giving little back. These researchers do not act in isolation but are situated within university and disciplinary contexts, which themselves continue to receive

critical scrutiny as sites of coloniality (Stein, 2022). These concerns have been echoed powerfully by overresearched and underresourced communities, often constructed as damaged and needy, culturally incompatible, or deviant through the stories and discourses of the powerful sectors in society. Tuck (2009) referred to this as damage-centered research and highlighted the role of researchers in perpetuating this orientation and narrative, often through the uncritical application of Eurocentric knowledge and practices or, as noted by Ka Canham (2024), suffocating frames of reference, for those racialized, marginalized, and other groups. Ignoring stories of marginalized communities or deliberately misinterpreting their cultural belief systems, conceptions of personhood, and ways of making meaning creates a kind of harm that has been described as epistemic violence by Spivak (1988) and as epistemological violence by Teo (2010). This kind of violence creates damage-centered narratives (Tuck, 2009) and discourses of the dominant (Green & Sonn, 2006) about historically oppressed groups and devalues their knowledge, and stories are often misrepresented, distorted, or exploited (Bhatia, 2018).

Decolonial methods seek to expand ecologies of knowledge (Santos, 2007; Sonn, 2016). There is an effort to recognize people and communities as epistemic agents who are capable of producing valid knowledge for their betterment. Research based on mutual reciprocity, care, trust, and ethical engagement with communities is one of the pivotal foundations of decolonial methods. There are many examples of this practice including various community-engaged research approaches (see Haapanen & Christens, 2021) that center the praxis, the synergy of theory, reflection, and action, such as youth participatory action research, participatory action research, and critical participatory action research (CPAR). CPAR draws on a diverse array of theories and methods, including surveys, interviews, and other creative tools in addressing the issues and challenges defined with and by communities who are often at the sharp end of oppressive systems, policies, and practices (Fine, 2018).

Several scholars have used CPAR as a decolonial strategy in different contexts such as responding to the increasing racism on a university campus (Dutta et al., 2023; Fernández et al., 2018), enacting epistemic justice through participatory research with African students at a university in South Africa (Kessi, 2017), and enacting feminist practice with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender,

intersex, queer, asexual and other sexually or gender diverse people young people (Fine & Torre, 2019). Fernández (2022) argued that CPAR can be a unique decolonial method if it is intentionally explicit in advancing the goal of reparation for communities who have been “displaced, dehumanized, and exploited as a result of *coloniality of power*” (Fernández, 2022, p. 47). Like Fernández and Ormond et al. (2024), we believe that decolonial methods—whether they are based in CPAR or rooted in any other critically centered research paradigms—must be rooted in participatory relational engagement that is based on mutual reciprocity, accountability, ethics of care, and trust. Methods that are decolonial aim to coconstruct and coproduce knowledge through relationality, and they implement community-determined goals for action.

The concept of mutual interdependence is illustrative in Fernández et al.’s (2018) research on the development of anticolonial and sociopolitical stances in student activists. Central to the process of doing participatory action research is coming together to identify issues and structural conditions that produce problems, examine existing information about the problem, design and enact actions to address the problem, and evaluate the actions and their impact. Vital to the cyclical process is a commitment to transparency and collaboration in decision making, centering the experiences and knowledge of those encountering the problems and troubling the researcher-participant binary in the process of research and action. The research collective developed the research questions about sociopolitical development, activism, and healing, together, as well as an interview guide used to interview activists and generate actions to address identified needs. The corpus of data for the project was made up of field notes, interviews, forums, and actions that were analyzed using standard thematic analysis framed using Black feminist theory (Fernández et al., 2018).

In another compelling example of community-engaged research using decolonial principles, Agung-Igusti et al. (2021; Sonn, 2018) described projects with a group of cultural workers from the African diaspora working toward racial justice and self-determination. The project took place in the context of antiblack racism rooted in Australia’s colonial history and White nation fantasy (Hage, 2000), which limits the capacities of young African people. The groups wanted to elevate and create new stories rooted in remembering and

rearticulating African heritage cultural memory as a resource for subjectivity within the context of Australian race relations. The group expressed the need to document, critique, and create a legacy of their efforts to curate new narratives and cultural resources not readily available in the public sphere. University scholar-activists have collaborated with the group, called *Next in Colour*, for over 6 years, starting with project evaluations and building a praxis collective through which to enact self-determined community-centered cultural action. As asserted by hooks (1990), “fundamental to the process of decentering the oppressive other and claiming our right to subjectivity is the insistence that we must determine how we will be and not rely on colonizing responses to our own legitimacy” (p. 22). This project created spaces for deconstruction and healing through memory and cultural retrieval, which informed new narratives of belonging borne in the diaspora. This process of working together has focused on relationship and trust building through the mutual sharing of life stories, goals, and aspirations and critical conversations about growing up and living in Australia as members of the African and other diasporas. The conversations can be difficult but essential in the process of naming the various trajectories of displacement and mobility of the diaspora, patriarchy within/outside the community, Whiteness, and cultural wealth, which is often not a focus of researchers. As noted by Sonn, Agung-Igusti, et al. (2024),

the deepening of understanding of both coloniality and the community cultural wealth of the African diaspora has been an important part of *Next in Colour*’s journey of archival retrieval, collective remembering, and community making. There is a refusal to focus on the Eurocentric knowledge process, White supremacy, and knowledge that has supported anti-Blackness. (p. 10)

The work of being with and becoming an outsider on the inside emphasizes examining positionality and deepening the practice of reflexivity to examine power/privilege/dispossession in qualitative community-engaged research.

The stories revealed how the African diaspora (a) created homeplaces for healing from the everyday labor of navigating hostile public and institutional spaces; (b) engaged memory and art making to reclaim stories that are vital to their cultural identities; and (c) identified how coloniality continues to shape their desire for racial justice and belonging. In this decolonial project, the participants in the community became active

coauthors and played a vital role in coproducing new meanings and stories about their lives.

Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic psychology, with its focus on individualism, is born from modernity's preoccupation with "progress" and the unfolding of the Western self as universal and separate from history. Thus, the examples of decolonial methods given above aim to disrupt the coloniality of Eurocentric knowledge, the assertion of the university as the only source of legitimate knowledge construction, and seek to create new decolonized concepts of self and personhood that are rooted in local communities and everyday struggles (Bhatia, 2021). Bhatia's decolonial research raised questions about why 356 million Indian youth (United Nations Population Fund, 2014), who make up the world's largest youth population, remained invisible in the discipline of psychology. Why were their stories not considered worth telling? To answer this question, he conducted extensive ethnographic research with young urban Indians from elite, middle- and working-class communities. Through this research, Bhatia has uncovered how legacies of colonialism and contemporary forms of "coloniality" are creating new identities of sexuality, work life, family, and social status. Taking a narrative and cultural approach, his research showed how postcolonial urban Indian youth imagine, refashion, and recreate their stories of self and others against the backdrop of neoliberal globalization. The knowledge has challenged Western psychology to recognize its imperialist and neocolonial gaze that continues to manifest through the export of Euro-American psychological instruments such as personality and intelligence tests, diversity seminars, and positive psychology discourses of self, happiness, and work to the Global South. Psychology typically frames problems related to structural inequality as individual problems. In contrast, his decolonial research has envisioned a psychology that centers questions of social justice and the public good.

Mutual Accompaniment, Solidarity, and Emancipation From Multiple Forms of Oppression

In their special issue on Decolonizing Psychological Science, Adams et al. (2015) identified psychosocial accompaniment as a decolonial method. Various traditions of scholarship have

informed our understanding of psychosocial accompaniment, including liberation theology and psychology (Watkins, 2021). In his vision for a new psychological practice, Martín-Baró (1994, p. 46) imagined a way of working from and with psychology "where the fulfillment of some does not require that others be deprived, where the interests of the minority do not demand the dehumanization of all."

Accompaniment entails a process where insiders or outsiders partner with marginalized communities intentionally in relationships of reciprocity and accountability to address the issues and challenges that produce injustice and social suffering. Watkins (2021) has written extensively about a decolonial approach to mutual accompaniment and a commitment to "the long haul of individual, social, and community transformation" (p. 118). Accompaniment is processual, an intentional process of creating settings, or contact zones, where differently positioned people come together to share the risk, power, and burden of change work that disproportionately falls on the shoulders of those who bear the burden of inequity. In their work on peace-building with people displaced and affected by war in Colombia, Sacipa-Rodriguez (2014) have shown how psychosocial accompaniment can be enacted through participatory work that demonstrates radical relationality at the heart of any decolonial methodology.

Lykes (1997) and Lykes and Távara (2020) have theorized accompaniment as a positionality in the context of their work with Mayan communities in Guatemala and Quechua communities in Peru. Accompaniment often involves varied activities aimed at awareness-raising, deconstruction, community organizing, as well as research and knowledge building that can support acts of social transformation. In her work with Aboriginal Elders in Western Australia, Quayle (2017; Quayle & Sonn, 2019, 2022) used accompaniment as an approach to bear witness to the life stories of Aboriginal Elders. As an outsider to the community, she spent time building relationships with Elders until she was invited to document and tell their stories and to use research as a platform to elevate the stories of dispossession of culture and country, resistance, and survival. In this role, she adopted a supportive voice as a form of solidarity praxis toward epistemic justice. Chase (2005) emphasized that the use of the supportive voice as a narrative strategy "aims not for establishing

authenticity but rather for creating a self-reflective and respectful distance between researchers' and narrators' voices" (p. 665). Quayle sought to stay close to the stories and center the Elders' voices, which meant keeping the researcher's voice to a minimum, guiding the reader, and making connections between stories and with relevant archives and academic literature, but presenting the Elders as the epistemic experts. For Quayle, adopting a supportive voice as a form of relational solidarity or faithful epistemic witnessing (Pillow, 2019) is akin to the function of an intermediary who supports expanding the spaces and possibilities for epistemic justice.

Counterstorytelling with communities who have endured long histories of dispossession is a key practice of epistemic justice. Dutta et al. (2022) in their efforts to enact emancipatory practice showed how the Miya Community Research Collective generates everyday knowledge, living thought, through poetry and other modalities to counter epistemic violence and erasure in the efforts to rehumanize Miya people. Dutta et al.'s work is an example of critical solidarity practice rooted in the struggles of resistance, uplifting "Miya people's stories at complex intersections of history, ecology, citizenship, and culture" (p. 67). They suggest that

counterstorytelling praxis is grounded in particular historical analyses and metabolized in rooted spaces. Yet in recognizing the indivisibility of justice and striving to un-erase their essence from subhuman (in) visibility, Miya people share historical, affective, and political convergences with people resisting legacies of alterity—people whose histories, experiences, and claims for justice defy normative categories or frames of understanding. (p. 68)

Critical mutual accompaniment is a form of solidarity praxis that requires full engagement with the coloniality of power and knowledge, including in our role with universities that participate in reproducing unequal power relationships. The positionality of critical accompaniment requires us to reflect on our positionalities and accountabilities critically while nurturing relationality and humility in our efforts as academics/scholars to contribute to healing and epistemic justice (Sonn, Fernández, et al., 2024a). Accompaniment is a relational practice that prioritizes deep engagement and accountability. This attitude can enhance the capacity of researchers to engage in culturally meaningful and sensitive processes of analysis, documenting, and reporting in any of the modes described in this article.

Going Forward

In this article, we outline the growing area of scholarly and activist engagement with the decolonial turn in psychology. Psychology has been relatively slow to engage with the resurgence of anticolonial, decolonial, and postcolonial scholarship and writing. Yet, colliding social, economic, and climate crises have been brought to the forefront by the COVID-19 pandemic, wars, starvation, humanitarian crises, and their negative sequelae in all spheres of life for those below the line of the human.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2020) noted that there has also been an epistemic crisis reflected in knowledge canons falling short in providing solutions to the challenges brought about by hundreds of years of the coloniality of the global world order. Historian Satia (2020, p. 4), for example, wrote that the record of "British humanitarianism" during imperialism submerges the record of "British inhumanity." She wrote that in the collective public memory, "redemptive mythos of colonial upliftment persistently masks the empire's abysmal history of looting and pillage, policy-driven famines, brutal crushing of rebellion, torture, concentration camps, aerial policing, and everyday racism and humiliation" (Satia, 2020, p. 4). A 2014 YouGov poll shows that 60% of the British public expressed pride in the legacy of the British Empire and 50% of them thought that the former colonies were better off due to colonialism (Dahlgreen, 2014). Paul Gilroy, a scholar of cultural and postcolonial studies, has described the British public's longing for the empire as "post-colonial melancholia," where the "wounds of imperial domination" have been mystified or forgotten. The decolonial moment in psychology is urgently needed to shed light on the colonial wounds and the subsequent forms of healing that can emerge from employing decolonial methods for creating knowledge that goes beyond the confines of the long duress of the colonial order. One of the legacies of colonialism is that systems of knowledge and ways of being and doing and aspirations of a "good life" linger on in the political, psychological, and social realm long after colonialism is gone. These new forms of coloniality have given rise to multiple global crises that have resulted in resurgent calls for freedom, justice, and liberation around the world. In the past decade or so, there has been a significant increase in writing on decoloniality and its implications for

psychology in different countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

Professional bodies in different countries have responded to calls for decolonization with apologies for its contributions to the oppression of racialized populations, including the *American Psychological Association* (2021), *Association of Canadian Psychology Regulatory Organizations* (2021), and the *Australian Psychological Society* (see Carey et al., 2017). Several publications, such as the volume *Decolonial Psychology: Toward Anticolonial Theories, Research, Training, and Practice* (Comas-Díaz et al., 2024) and several special issues of the *American Psychologist* on decolonial psychology also reflect responses to calls to decolonize psychological science. Many books have been developed by scholars from different countries including volumes that capture *Feminist Decolonial Community Psychology* (Boonzaier & van Niekerk, 2019), *Stevens, and Sonn* (2021); a recent *Handbook on Decolonial Community Psychology* (Sonn, Fernández, et al., 2024b), and special issues of the *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* (Adams et al., 2015), the *Journal of Social Issues* (Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective, 2022), and the *American Psychologist* (Bhatia & Priya, 2021). This is not an exhaustive list, but it gives some idea of the various place-based efforts to expand psychology unlinking it from the hegemonic Euro-American assumptions that have shaped ways of knowing, doing, and being to the exclusion of other knowledges. To decolonize psychology and its attachment to monological methodolatry, the primacy of method would mean pluriversality, or as noted by Misra et al. (in press),

diverse topics and questions, additional methodological approaches and interpretations, more equitable knowledge outlets and applications, and certainly more diverse researchers and frameworks for contributing knowledge, if research wants to do justice to the varieties of human mental life. (p. 10)

While still relatively early in the resurgent decolonial moment, qualitative inquiry is well placed in this regard as it continues to challenge canonical archives and methodologies. The decolonial turn demands that we push further into questioning and problematizing deep assumptions about objectivity, universality, and ethics. Decolonial methods mean an embrace of pluriversality and an ethico-onto-epistemic orientation in favor of valuing and nourishing interconnected human

and nonhuman life. We cannot set up a new school of decoloniality while still keeping intact the larger Eurocentric modes of knowing, thinking, feeling, and structures of Western epistemology (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). We first have to imagine new methodological inquiries and practices to create new forms of pluriversal decolonial knowledge. This process entails the joyful crossing of disciplinary borders, where social sciences meet humanities, aesthetics, and arts, to create spaces for thinking and doing. Some scholar activists have shown the transformative potential of the deep and long-term engagement with “communities” and linking local struggles for justice translocally (Sonn, Fernández, et al., 2024a).

In this article, we introduced some of this scholarship, which emphasizes the importance of understanding the varied routes and roots of decolonial activist and scholarly tributaries and the explicit goals of examining coloniality of knowledge, power, and being. We suggest there are various examples of how researchers have enacted decolonial methods that entail an ethical process of unsettling hegemonic Eurocentric ways of knowing, doing, and being and expanding ecologies of knowledge toward pluriversality (Escobar, 2020). We offered five ways in which decolonial methods have been enacted in qualitative inquiry in psychology. These are not mutually exclusive and are anchored by the ethical commitment to relationality and the analyses of the colonial matrix of power and how it continues to shape understandings of self, relationships, and others in the present. Decolonial research in psychology is an unsettling project as much as it is a project of embracing alterity. The challenge and opportunity for researchers in psychology is to engage with the global movement toward anticolonial practices that deliver on pluriversal psychologies.

References

- Adames, H. Y., Chavez-Dueñas, N. Y., & Comas-Díaz, L. (2024). Introduction: Decoloniality as a transformative force in psychology: An orientation to this book. In L. Comas-Díaz, H. Y. Adames, & N. Y. Chavez-Dueñas (Eds.), *Decolonial psychology: Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice* (pp. 3–11). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-001>

- Adams, G., Dobles, I., Gómez, L. H., Kurtiş, T., & Molina, L. E. (2015). Decolonizing psychological science: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jsp.p.v3i1.564>
- Adams, G., & Estrada-Villalta, S. (2017). Theory from the South: A decolonial approach to the psychology of global inequality. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 18, 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.07.031>
- Agung-Igusti, R. P., Sonn, C. C., Dau, A., Deng, E. E., Komba, G., Akoul, N., & Ruach, R. N. (2021). Colour between the lines: Self-determination and the creation of settings as resistance to structural violence. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice*, 12(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.17161/gjcpp.v12i2.20646>
- American Psychological Association. (2021). *Apology to people of color for APA's role in promoting, perpetuating, and failing to challenge racism, racial discrimination, and human hierarchy in U.S.* <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/racism-apology>
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Association of Canadian Psychology Regulatory Organizations. (2021, August 27). *An apology to Indigenous people and a pledge to be anti-racist.* <https://acpro-aocrp.ca/an-apology-to-indigenous-people-and-a-pledge-to-be-anti-racist/>
- Balla, P., Jackson, K., Quayle, A. F., Sonn, C. C., & Price, R. K. (2022). “Don’t let anybody ever put you down culturally.... it’s not good...”: Creating spaces for Black women’s healing. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 70(3–4), 352–364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12607>
- Beals, A. M., Thomas, D., Fernández, J. S., Wilson, C. L., & Palmer, G. (2021). Resisting the coloniality and colonialism of a westernized community psychology: Toward a critical racial justice praxis. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice*, 12(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17161/gjcpp.v12i2.20644>
- Bell, D., Canham, H., Dutta, U., & Fernández, J. S. (2020). Retrospective autoethnographies: A call for decolonial imaginings for the new university. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26(7), 849–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419857743>
- Bhatia, S. (2002). Orientalism in Euro-American and Indian psychology: Historical representations of “natives” in colonial and postcolonial contexts. *History of Psychology*, 5(4), 376–398. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1093-4510.5.4.376>
- Bhatia, S. (2018). *Decolonizing psychology: Globalization, social justice, and Indian youth identities.* Oxford University Press.
- Bhatia, S. (2019). Searching for justice in an unequal world: Reframing Indigenous psychology as a cultural and political project. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000109>
- Bhatia, S. (2021). Decolonization and coloniality in human development: Neoliberalism, globalization and narratives of Indian youth. *Human Development*, 64(4–6), 207–221. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000513084>
- Bhatia, S., Long, W., Pickren, W., & Rutherford, A. (2024). Engaging with decoloniality, decolonization, and histories of psychology otherwise. In L. Comas-Díaz, H. Y. Adames, & N. Y. Chavez-Dueñas (Eds.), *Decolonial psychology: Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice* (pp. 61–85). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-004>
- Bhatia, S., & Priya, K. R. (2018). Decolonizing culture: Euro-American psychology and the shaping of neoliberal selves in India. *Theory & Psychology*, 28(5), 645–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354318791315>
- Bhatia, S., & Priya, K. R. (2021). Coloniality and psychology: From silencing to re-centering marginalized voices in postcolonial times. *Review of General Psychology*, 25(4), 422–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680211046507>
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking “acculturation” in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development*, 44(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000057036>
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2004). Culture, hybridity, and the dialogical self: Cases from the South Asian diaspora. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 11(3), 224–240. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca1103_4
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2023). Outsider at home: Reading Babasaheb Ambedkar as a radical, decolonial psychologist. *Journal of Personality*, 91(1), 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12751>
- Biko, S. (1988). *I write what I like.* Penguin Books.
- Boonzaier, F., & van Niekerk, T. (2019). *Decolonial feminist community psychology.* Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20001-5>
- Bulhan, H. A. (1985). *Frantz Fanon and the psychology of oppression.* Plenum Press.
- Bulhan, H. A. (2015). Stages of colonialism in Africa: From occupation of land to occupation of being. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 239–256. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jsp.p.v3i1.143>
- Carey, T. A., Dudgeon, P., Hammond, S. W., Hirvonen, T., Kyrios, M., Roufeil, L., & Smith, P. (2017). The Australian Psychological Society’s apology to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. *Australian Psychologist*, 52(4), 261–267. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12300>

- Carolissen, R. L., & Duckett, P. S. (2018). Teaching toward decoloniality in community psychology and allied disciplines: Editorial introduction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62(3–4), 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12297>
- Césaire, A., & Kelley, R. D. G. (2000). *Discourse on colonialism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Chase, S. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research methods* (3rd ed., pp. 651–680). Sage Publications.
- Ciofalo, N. (2019). *Indigenous psychologies in an era of decolonization*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04822-8>
- Ciofalo, N., Dudgeon, P., & Nikora, L. W. (2022). Indigenous community psychologies, decolonization, and radical imagination within ecologies of knowledges. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 69(3–4), 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12583>
- Comas-Díaz, L. (2021). AfroLatinx females: Coloniality, gender, and transformation. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 22(4), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15240657.2021.1996741>
- Comas-Díaz, L., Adames, H. Y., & Chavez-Dueñas, N. Y. (Eds.). (2024). *Decolonial psychology: Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-000>
- Dahlgreen, W. (2014). *The British Empire is “something to be proud of”*. YouGov. <https://yougov.co.uk/politics/articles/9954-britain-proud-its-empire>
- David, E. J. R., & Okazaki, S. (2006). Colonial mentality: A review and recommendation for Filipino American psychology. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.12.1.1>
- Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective. (2021). General psychology otherwise: A decolonial articulation. *Review of General Psychology*, 25(4), 339–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680211048177>
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1994). *The souls of Black folk*. Dover Publications.
- Dudgeon, P., & Walker, R. (2015). Decolonising Australian psychology: Discourses, strategies, and practice. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 276–297. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.126>
- Dutta, U. (2022). Decentering “community” in community psychology: Towards radical relationality and resistance. In S. Kessi, S. Suffla, & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Decolonial enactments in community psychology* (pp. 53–72). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75201-9_4
- Dutta, U., Azad, A. K., & Hussain, S. M. (2022). Counterstorytelling as epistemic justice: Decolonial community-based praxis from the global south. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 69(1–2), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12545>
- Dutta, U., Fernández, J. S., Galletta, A., & Langhout, R. D. (2023). Participatory action research as movement toward radical relationality, epistemic justice, and transformative intervention: A multivocal reflection. In H. Cooper, M. N. Coutanche, L. M. McMullen, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (2nd ed., pp. 305–327). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000319-015>
- Erasmus, Z. (Ed.). (2001). *Coloured by history, shaped by place: New perspectives on coloured identities in Cape Town* (1st ed.). Kwela Books.
- Escobar, A. (2020). *Pluriversal politics: The real and the possible*. Duke University Press.
- Fals-Borda, O. (1987). The application of participatory action-research in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 2(4), 329–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026858098700200401>
- Fanon, F. (1982). *Black skin, white masks* (1st Evergreen ed.). Grove Press.
- Fernández, J. S. (2022). A *Mujerista* liberation psychology perspective on *Testimonio* to cultivate decolonial healing. *Women & Therapy*, 45(2–3), 131–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2022.2095101>
- Fernández, J. S., Gaston, J. Y., Nguyen, M., Rovaris, J., Robinson, R. L., & Aguilar, D. N. (2018). Documenting sociopolitical development via participatory action research (PAR) with women of color student activists in the neoliberal university. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 6(2), 591–607. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v6i2.900>
- Fernández, J. S., Sonn, C. C., Carolissen, R., & Stevens, G. (2021). Roots and routes toward decoloniality within and outside psychology praxis. *Review of General Psychology*, 25(4), 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680211002437>
- Fine, M. (2018). *Just research in contentious times: Widening the methodological imagination*. Teachers College Press.
- Fine, M. (2021). Decolonizing critical knowledges borne in the borderlands: From “morbid symptoms” to critical solidarities. In G. Stevens & C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 59–77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_4
- Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2019). Critical participatory action research: A feminist project for validity and solidarity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 43(4), 433–444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319865255>
- Fish, J., & Gone, J. P. (2024). Beyond decolonization: Anticolonial methodologies for Indigenous futurity in psychological research. In L. Comas-Díaz, H. Y. Adames, & N. Y. Chavez-Dueñas (Eds.), *Decolonial*

- psychology: *Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice* (pp. 119–141). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-006>
- Flores Osorio, J., & Vicente Xiloj, M. (2022). Community psychology and the liberation process of First Nations in Guatemala. In C. Kagan, J. Akhurst, J. Alfaro, R. Lawthom, M. Richards, & A. Zambrano (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of community psychology: Facing global crises with hope* (pp. 293–306). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429325663>
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Penguin Books.
- French, B. H., Lewis, J. A., Mosley, D., Adames, H. Y., Chavez-Dueñas, N. Y., Chen, G. A., & Neville, H. A. (2020). Toward a psychological framework of radical healing in communities of color. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 48(1), 14–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019843506>
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- Gee, G., Dudgeon, P., Schultz, C., Hart, A., & Kelly, K. (2014). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social and emotional wellbeing. In P. Dudgeon, H. Milroy, & R. Walker (Eds.), *Working together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander mental health and wellbeing principles and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 55–68). Commonwealth Government of Australia. <https://www.telethonkids.org.au/globalassets/media/documents/aboriginal-health/working-together-second-edition/wt-part-1-chapt-4-final.pdf>
- Glover, M., Dudgeon, P., & Huygens, I. (2005). Colonisation and racism. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being* (pp. 330–347). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gobodo-Madikizela, P. (2012). Remembering the past: Nostalgia, traumatic memory, and the legacy of apartheid. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 18(3), 252–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029078>
- Gone, J. P. (2016). Alternative knowledges and the future of community psychology: Provocations from an American Indian healing tradition. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 58(3–4), 314–321. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12046>
- Gone, J. P. (2021). Decolonization as methodological innovation in counseling psychology: Method, power, and process in reclaiming American Indian therapeutic traditions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 68(3), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000500>
- Green, M. J., & Sonn, C. C. (2006). Problematising the discourses of the dominant: Whiteness and reconciliation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16(5), 379–395. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.882>
- Grosfoguel, R. (2002). Colonial difference, geopolitics of knowledge, and global coloniality in the modern/colonial capitalist world-system. *Review—Fernand Braudel Center*, 25(3), 203–224. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40241548>
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political-economy: Transmodernity, decolonial thinking, and global coloniality. *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/T411000004>
- Haapanen, K. A., & Christens, B. D. (2021). Community-engaged research approaches: Multiple pathways to health equity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 67(3–4), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12529>
- Hage, G. (2000). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Routledge.
- Hartmann, W. E., Wendt, D. C., Burrage, R. L., Pomerville, A., & Gone, J. P. (2019). American Indian historical trauma: Anticolonial prescriptions for healing, resilience, and survivance. *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000326>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2018). *All about love: New visions* (1st ed.). William Morrow.
- Jacobson, D., & Mustafa, N. (2019). Social identity map: A reflexivity tool for practicing explicit positionality in critical qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919870075>
- ka Canham, H. (2024). The black failure of psychology—An errant walking away. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 18, 1298–1311. https://discourseunit.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/1298_canham.pdf
- Kessi, S. (2017). Community social psychologies for decoloniality: An African perspective on epistemic justice in higher education. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 47(4), 506–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246317737917>
- Kessi, S., Suffla, S., & Seedat, M. (2022). Towards a decolonial community psychology: Derivatives, disruptions and disobediences. In S. Kessi, S. Suffla, & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Decolonial enactments in community psychology* (pp. 3–12). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75201-9_1
- Kiguwa, P., & Segalo, P. (2018). Decolonising psychology in residential and open distance e-learning

- institutions: Critical reflections. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 48(3), 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246318786605>
- Land, C. (2015). *Decolonizing solidarity: Dilemmas and directions for supporters of Indigenous struggles*. Zed Books.
- Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x>
- Lykes, M. B. (1997). Activist participatory research among the Maya of Guatemala: Constructing meanings from situated knowledge. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 725–746. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1997.tb02458.x>
- Lykes, M. B., & Távora, G. (2020). Feminist participatory action research: Coconstructing liberation psychological praxis through dialogic relationality and critical reflexivity. In L. Comas-Díaz & E. Torres Rivera (Eds.), *Liberation psychology: Theory, method, practice, and social justice* (pp. 111–130). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000198-007>
- Macleod, C., Bhatia, S., & Kessi, S. (2017). Post-colonialism and psychology: Growing interest and promising potential. In C. Willig & W. Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 306–317). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526405555.n18>
- Macleod, C., Bhatia, S., & Liu, W. (2020). Feminisms and decolonizing psychology: Possibilities and challenges. *Feminism & Psychology*, 30(3), 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353520932810>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 240–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2016). *Outline of ten theses on coloniality and decoloniality* [Foundation]. Fondation-Frantz Fanon. <https://fondation-frantzfanon.com/outline-of-ten-theses-on-coloniality-and-decoloniality/>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2017a). Fanon and decolonial thought. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 799–803). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-588-4_506
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2017b). Frantz Fanon and the decolonial turn in psychology: From modern/colonial methods to the decolonial attitude. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 47(4), 432–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246317737918>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2021). Decolonial psychology as a counter-catastrophic science. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. vii–xiv). Springer.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1994). *Writings for a liberation psychology* (A. Aron & S. Corne, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
- Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Misra, G., Sundararajan, L., Teo, T., Sian-Kat Ting, R., & Yang, J. (in press). Decolonial research practices from an Indigenous psychology perspective: Critical contributions to knowledge. *American Psychologist*.
- Montero, M., & Sonn, C. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Psychology of liberation: Theory and applications*. Springer.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. (2020). The dynamics of epistemological decolonisation in the 21st century: Towards epistemic freedom. *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, 40(1), 16–48. <https://doi.org/10.35293/srsa.v40i1.268>
- Neville, H. A., Lee, B. A., & Maghsoodi, A. H. (2024). Decolonizing and building liberatory psychological sciences. In L. Comas-Díaz, H. Y. Adames, & N. Y. Chavez-Dueñas (Eds.), *Decolonial psychology: Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice* (pp. 89–118). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-005>
- Ormond, A., Segalo, P., Torre, M. E., & Fine, M. (2024). Decolonizing in a transnational feminist commons perched precariously between the academy and movements for justice. In L. Comas-Díaz, H. Y. Adames, & N. Y. Chavez-Dueñas (Eds.), *Decolonial psychology: Toward anticolonial theories, research, training, and practice* (pp. 169–201). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000376-008>
- Ozoguz, S. (2025). “No but where are you really from?”: Critically examining reflexivity through field notes from a feminist psychological research in Turkey. *Feminism & Psychology*, 35(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593535241293546>
- Pillow, W. S. (2019). Epistemic witnessing: Theoretical responsibilities, decolonial attitude and lenticular futures. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(2), 118–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1576938>
- Quayle, A. F. (2017). *Narrating oppression, psychosocial suffering and survival through the Bush Babies Project* [Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University]. <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/id/eprint/34839>
- Quayle, A. F., & Sonn, C. (2022). Critical narrative inquiry as psychosocial accompaniment with Aboriginal communities. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative cross-cultural research methods* (pp. 160–179). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800376625.00019>
- Quayle, A. F., & Sonn, C. C. (2019). Amplifying the voices of Indigenous elders through community arts

- and narrative inquiry: Stories of oppression, psychosocial suffering, and survival. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 64(1–2), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12367>
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Ratele, K. (2019). *The world looks like this from here: Thoughts on African psychology*. Wits University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18772/12019093900>
- Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective. (2022). Decoloniality as a social issue for psychological study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 78(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12502>
- Reyes Cruz, M., & Sonn, C. C. (2015). (De)colonizing culture in community psychology: Reflections from critical social science. In R. D. Goodman & P. C. Gorski (Eds.), *Decolonizing “multicultural” counselling through social justice* (pp. 127–146). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1283-4_10
- Rua, M., Groot, S., Hodgetts, D., Nikora, L. W., Masters-Awatere, B., King, P., Karapu, R., & Robertson, N. (2021). Decoloniality in being Māori and community psychologists: Advancing an evolving and culturally-situated approach. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 177–191). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_10
- Scipia-Rodriguez, S. (Ed.). (2014). *Psychosocial approaches to peace-building in Colombia*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04549-8>
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Santos, B. D. S. (2007). *Cognitive justice in a global world: Prudent knowledges for a decent life*. Lexington Books.
- Satia, P. (2020). *Time’s monster: How history makes history*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674250574>
- Segalo, P. (2016). Using cotton, needles and threads to break the women’s silence: Embroideries as a decolonising framework. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(3), 246–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2015.1047661>
- Segalo, P., Manoff, E., & Fine, M. (2015). Working with embroideries and counter-maps: Engaging memory and imagination within decolonizing frameworks. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 342–364. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jsp.p.v3i1.145>
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.
- Sonn, C. C. (2018). Mobilising decolonial approaches for community-engaged research for racial justice. *The Australian Community Psychologist*, 29(2), 8–21.
- Sonn, C. C. (2012). Speaking unspoken memories: Remembering apartheid racism in Australia. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 18(3), 240–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029457>
- Sonn, C. C. (2016). Swampscott in international context: Expanding our ecology of knowledge. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 58(3–4), 309–313. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12038>
- Sonn, C. C. (2024). Assembling decolonial anti-racist praxis from the margins: Reflections from critical community psychology. In D. Bargallie & N. Fernando (Eds.), *Critical racial and decolonial literacies* (1st ed., pp. 164–177). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.12348214.19>
- Sonn, C. C., Agung-Igusti, R. P., Komba, G., Ruach, R. N., & Deng, E. E. (2024). Freedom dreaming from the university-community nexus: Relational praxis as counterspace. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 18(7), Article e12990. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12990>
- Sonn, C. C., Baker, A. M., & Agung-Igusti, R. P. (2021). Promoting epistemic justice: Community arts, identity and belonging among African diaspora in Australia. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 141–157). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_8
- Sonn, C. C., Fernández, J. S., Moura, J. F., Madyaningrum, M. E., & Malherbe, N. (2024a). Decolonisation in and beyond community psychologies: A transnational plurilogue. In C. C. Sonn, J. S. Fernández, J. F. Moura, Jr., M. E. Madyaningrum, & N. Malherbe (Eds.), *Handbook of decolonial community psychology* (pp. 1–22). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-67035-0_1
- Sonn, C. C., Fernández, J. S., Moura, J. F., Madyaningrum, M. E., & Malherbe, N. (Eds.). (2024b). *Handbook of decolonial community psychology*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-67035-0>
- Sonn, C. C., & Fisher, A. T. (2003). Identity and oppression: Differential responses to an in-between status. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(1–2), 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023030805485>
- Sonn, C. C., & Lewis, R. C. (2009). Immigration and identity: The ongoing struggles for liberation. In M. Montero & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Psychology of liberation: Theory and applications* (pp. 115–133). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-85784-8_6
- Sonn, C. C., & Stevens, G. (2021). Tracking the decolonial turn in contemporary community psychology: Expanding socially just knowledge archives, ways of being and modes of praxis. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 1–19). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_1

- Sonn, C. C., Stevens, G., & Duncan, N. (2013). Decolonisation, critical methodologies and why stories matter. In G. Stevens, N. Duncan, & D. Hook (Eds.), *Race, memory and the apartheid archive: Towards a transformative psychosocial praxis* (pp. 295–314). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137263902_15
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan.
- Stein, S. (2022). *Unsettling the university: Confronting the colonial foundations of US higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.56021/9781421445052>
- Stevens, G., Duncan, N., & Hook, D. (2013). *Race, memory and the apartheid archive: Towards a transformative psychosocial praxis*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137263902>
- Stevens, G., & Sonn, C. C. (Eds.). (2021). *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3>
- Suffla, S., & Seedat, M. (2021). Africa's knowledge archives, black consciousness and reimagining community psychology. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 21–38). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_2
- Teo, T. (2010). What is epistemological violence in the empirical social sciences? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(5), 295–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00265.x>
- Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 116–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000622>
- Thambinathan, V., & Kinsella, A. E. (2021). Decolonizing methodologies in qualitative research: Creating spaces for transformative praxis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211014766>
- Thiong'o, N. W. (1986). *Decolonization of mind: The politics of language in language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409–428. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization*, 1(1), 1–40.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (Eds.). (2018). *Toward what justice? Describing diverse dreams of justice in education* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351240932>
- United Nations Population Fund. (2014). *United Nations annual report*. <https://www.unfpa.org/annual-report-2014>
- Watkins, M. (2021). Toward a decolonial approach to psychosocial accompaniment from the “outside”. In G. Stevens & C. C. Sonn (Eds.), *Decoloniality and epistemic justice in contemporary community psychology* (pp. 101–120). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72220-3_6
- Watkins, M., & Shulman, H. (2008). *Toward psychologies of liberation*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230227736>
- Wilbur, R. E., & Gone, J. P. (2023). Beyond resilience: A scoping review of Indigenous survivance in the health literature. *Development and Psychopathology*, 35(5), 2226–2240. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579423000706>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publications.

Received August 4, 2024
Revision received June 3, 2025
Accepted June 4, 2025 ■